

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/324,368	NAGAOKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711	

All Participants:

(1) Jeffrey C. Mullis.

(2) Linda Deschere.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 February 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NONE

Claims discussed:

3, 8-11

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

09/324,368
 Priority Examiner
 Art Unit 1711

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' attorney was contacted to cancel claim 3 which was previously indicated as drawn to a non-elected species but which was now dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicants' attorney agreed to do this by examiner's amendment. Applicants' attorney was told that claims 8-11 would be cancelled as being drawn to an invention non elected without traverse. .